DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 240 CG 026 985

AUTHOR Mack, Delores E.; And Others
TITLE Inter-Ethnic Relations on Campus: Can't We All Get Along?
PUB DATE 15 Aug 95
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (103rd, New York, NY, August 11-15, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Interrelationships; Ethnic Discrimination; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnicity; *Ethnic Relations; Ethnic Status; Higher Education; Intercultural Communication; Political Correctness; Social Integration; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Student Subcultures
IDENTIFIERS Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

ABSTRACT

Seniors (N=150) from five private colleges completed and returned a survey consisting of five sections: (1) the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure; (2) demographic information and questions about the extent of the respondent's interaction with other racial/ethnic groups; (3) questions about comfort level when interacting with Asian, White, Black, and Hispanic individuals; (4) student's perception of the college environment, with questions about the interracial climate, college support for ethnic group activities, ethnic self-segregation, pressure to attend ethnic activities and others; and (5) a request to list the names (or code names) of their good friends and indicate their ethnicity. Data collected from these surveys suggest that political correctness may make it difficult to obtain accurate data from respondents; more subtle measures of attitudes and interactions should be considered for future studies. The data also indicate that ethnic minority groups differ not only from White students, but also from each other in how they perceive and interact with each other. Future research should not only map out the patterns of interaction, but indicate at least limited ways in which ethnic interaction can be improved. Contains 44 references and 6 tables. (TS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 240

INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS ON CAMPUS: CAN'T WE ALL GET ALONG?

Delores E. Mack, Traci W. Tucker, Randi Archuleta, Gary DeGroot, Alina A. Hernandez, and Susan Oh Cha
Monsour Counseling Center
The Claremont Colleges

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. TUCKER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the 103rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, New York, August 15, 1995.

CG026985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS ON CAMPUS: CAN'T WE ALL GET ALONG?

Delores E. Mack, Traci W. Tucker, Randi Archuleta, Gary DeGroot,
Alina A. Hernandez and Susan Oh Cha
Monsour Counseling Center
The Claremont Colleges

While our colleges and universities reflect to some extent the unease and hostility that have been growing in American society, it is also true that these institutions represent a unique opportunity for the development of harmonious relations among our many ethnic groups. The open exchange in classrooms, social activities, sport teams, and residential halls all contribute to a type of interchange found nowhere else in our society, with the possible exception of the military. What have been the results of this interchange?

The body of research on the ways in which White students and ethnic minority students have adjusted to each other is quite limited (deArmas & McDavis, 1981), with much of the research focusing on the adjustment of African American students or on the attitudes of White students. Leonard and Locke (1993) reported that Black and White students held primarily negative stereotypes about their mutual communication styles (e.g., they described each other as boastful, aggressive, and noisy). In his study of Stanford students, Bunzel (1992) found that there were no significant levels of friendship among Black and White students, with most interaction occurring in residence halls and classes, and very little interaction in social settings. Balenger, Hoffman, and Sedlacek (1992) and Sedlacek (1987) in studies spanning a ten and twenty year period respectively, note little change in the attitudes of White students toward Black students. White student attitudes were replete with negative stereotypes and discomfort in a wide variety of social situations. Fuertes and Sedlacek (1990) reported that White students have more negative attitudes toward Black students than toward Hispanic students.

Studies have typically found that African American students had greater concerns about academic performance and financial issues than White students, and felt isolated, lonely, different, and discriminated against (e.g., Westbrook, Miyares, & Roberts, 1978; Tate & Barker, 1978; Boyd, Shueman, McMullan, & Fretz, 1979). More recent studies on Hispanic students have found that they also experienced greater academic and financial stress (Quintana, Vogel, & Ybarra, 1991). Some studies on Asian students have described them as a model minority with attitudes and behavior more similar to those of White students. However, a study by Toupin and Son (1991) found that Asian Americans had lower GPAs, were less likely to be on the deans' list, and were more likely to be placed on academic probation than a group of white students matched with their Asian counterparts on socio-economic background and intellectual ability.

There are fewer comparative studies which have examined the differences among various ethnic groups. Patterson , Sedlacek, and Perry (1984) found that African American students were more likely to perceive racism, and were less comfortable interacting with White students than Hispanic students. Similarly, Webster, Sedlacek, and Miyares (1979) found that Hispanic students were less likely to view themselves as victims of racism than Black students. Stephan and Stephan (1989) also found that Hispanic students expressed less intergroup anxiety, had fewer negative attitudes, and experienced more positive contacts with Caucasians than Asian students. On the other hand, Mack and Pittman (1993) found that Black and Latino students were more likely to perceive racism on campus than White or Asian students. Moreover, Asian students were markedly more comfortable than Latino or Black students interacting with White students. Loo and Rolinson (1986) found that there were significant differences between the various ethnic groups (Chicanos, Asians, African Americans, Filipinos, Native Americans and racially mixed) with respect to the extent of their alienation from university life. In an extensive study of racial/ethnic interaction, Hurtado, Dey, and Trevino (1994) found that students of color interacted more across different ethnic/racial groups than White students. They also found that ethnic minority students (especially African Americans) felt more excluded from school activities because of their ethnicity than White students. Furthermore, ethnic minority students were more likely than White students to experience racial insults or threats made by other students.

Most of the research on ethnic group adjustment and interaction have examined the ways in which one or more ethnic groups interacted with or were viewed by the dominant White majority. However, within the last two decades there have been dramatic changes in the demographic make-up of the U.S. population with some estimates indicating that by the year 2010 non-whites will comprise the majority of the population (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1991). This increase in America's ethnic population has created a rapid change in the ethnic make-up of our schools. The increasing diversity of our schools has been accompanied by an increase in group conflict (Ehrlich, 1995). Soriano, Soriano, and Jimenez (1994) reported on the increase in school violence: they noted that hate crimes had occurred in one-third of Los Angeles' junior and middle schools and that 32% of a national sample of high school students reported incidents of racially motivated violence in their schools. Ehrlich (1995) reported that there had been a sharp increase in the number of colleges and universities reporting ethnoviolence from 42 in 1987 to 113 in 1989. He noted that ethnoviolence was now common on campuses (71% of the schools in 1992-93 reported such incidents), was traumatic, and affected others (co-victimization) not directly touched by the violence.

Although much of the data indicate that campus ethnoviolence is perpetrated by white males, other evidence suggests that ethnoviolence occurs between various ethnic minority groups. Evidence from community sources indicates that an increasing number of gang killings, prison riots, and middle and high school brawls can be traced to ethnic conflict between Latinos and Blacks (Rodriguez, 1994). The conflicts between Koreans and African Americans in several cities have been well publicized. Less well-known is the conflict between Latino and Asian gangs in Southern California.

Consequently, it is important for psychologists and other social scientists to examine the ways in which members of our rapidly increasing ethnic minority population interact with each other as well as with White America. Examination of inter-ethnic relations requires a complexity which many previous research studies have not employed with their tendency to focus on one or two ethnic groups. The pilot study which is reported below is an attempt to gather preliminary information about this increasingly complex area. This study will examine how members of several different ethnic groups (Black, Asian, Latino, and White students) view each other and interact in the college environment.

METHOD

For this pilot study, a survey was mailed to all seniors at five small, private, and highly selective colleges in California. Because of the small numbers of Black (35) and Latino (81) seniors, these two groups of students were sent a second mailing approximately two weeks after the first mailing was sent.

The survey was divided into five sections. The first section (23 items) consisted of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992). This instrument divides ethnic identity into three components: Affirmation and Belonging or a sense of ethnic pride (5 items); Ethnic Behaviors and Practices, such as attending social or cultural functions (2 items); and Ethnic Identity Achievement, a component focusing on exploration of and commitment to one's ethnic identity (7 items). Respondents rated their agreement with items on a 4-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," with a higher score indicating a higher level of ethnic identification.

The second, third, and fourth sections of the questionnaire were slightly modified versions of the questionnaire utilized by Patterson et al. (1984) to assess various aspects of interracial interaction. The second section (in addition to collecting demographic information), asked respondents eight questions about the extent of their interaction with other racial/ethnic groups. This section included questions on dating, studying, eating, partying, and other behaviors common for college students. Typically, students were asked to select one of the following responses:

1. Usually members of your own race/ethnic group
2. Usually a mixed race or ethnic group
3. Usually members of another race/ethnic group
4. Not applicable

The third section asked students 11 questions about their comfort level when interacting with Asian, White, Black, and Hispanic individuals. All of the questions referred to issues of interaction with other students with the exception of one question which focused on the counseling situation. Students rated their comfort level on a five-point scale ranging from "very comfortable" to "very uncomfortable." In order to eliminate an order effect, four

different versions of the questionnaire were created, with each version rotating the order in which respondents were asked to rate their comfort with the different ethnic groups.

The fourth section focused on the student's perception of the college environment with twelve questions about the interracial climate, college support for ethnic group activities, ethnic self-segregation, pressure to attend ethnic activities and others. Perceptions of the college environment were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" (1) to "strongly disagree" (5). Examples of these items include:

> I feel left out of things because of my race/ethnic group while attending this college.
> The college is trying to eliminate racism/ethnocentrism.
> Ethnic/racial organizations on campus contribute to the elimination of racism and ethnocentrism.

The fifth section asked respondents to list the names (or code names) of their good friends and indicate their ethnicity. They were asked to create an identical list for their less intimate friends or acquaintances. This section was included to determine what, if any, effect students' friendship patterns had on their general attitudes about the various ethnic groups. Contact theory would predict that when there is a high degree of personal contact, especially when individuals are of similar status or the ethnic minority is of a higher status, feelings of personal animosity and social distance will lessen.

Subjects

One hundred and fifty students (16.9% of all seniors) returned the survey. The Black (22.9%) and Latino (23.5%) response rates were slightly higher than the overall response rate. Survey respondents included 87 White, 29 Asian, 19 Latino, and 8 Black students. There were also 7 students who identified their ethnicity as a mixture of various groups. Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents were White, 19.3% Asian, 12.7% Latino, 5.3% Black, and 4.7% Mixed. While there were no official records of Asian enrollment, estimates from Asian organizations suggested that their enrollment as seniors ranged from 12% to 23% at the five colleges. Consequently, it was not unreasonable for 19.3% of the respondents to be Asian.

Seventy-one per cent of the sample were female, while 28% were male. One student did not list gender. Although females were over-represented in the sample (they were 50.3% of the seniors) there were no significant differences in the percentages of male and female respondents by ethnicity.

The ages of students ranged from 18 to 44, with 92.7% of the sample between the ages of 18 and 23.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RESULTS

Three issues must be addressed before reviewing the data from this study. First, this is a pilot study and because of the small sample size we did not expect strong effects. Consequently, we will not report data on friendship patterns; however, data from the other areas surveyed will be examined for trends or patterns in behavior. Secondly, because we were conducting a large number of comparisons, we decided to be quite conservative and selected an alpha level of .001 for statistical signficance. Finally, in planning this study on inter-ethnic relations, we did not anticipate that such a large number of students would be categorized as having "mixed" ethnic origins. Although we recognized that this group was quite varied and included different types of race/ethnic mixing, we decided to include this small group of students in some of our analyses.

Ethnic Identity Scale

The reliability analysis for each subscale was computed using Chronbachs Alpha. A reliability of .8650 was achieved for the Affirmation and Belonging subscale and .8614 for the Ethnic Identity Achievement scale; however, the reliability for Ethnic Behaviors was only .5094. Consequently, further analyses focused on the first two scales noted.

A one-way analysis of variance of the Affirmation and Belonging subscale by ethnicity was conducted, yielding F (4, 145) = 8.07, $p<.0001$. Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests were then run to determine which group means were significantly different from each other. This revealed that Latinos, Africans, and Asians had significantly higher levels of Affirmation and Belonging than the Mixed group of students; furthermore, Latinos had a significantly higher score than White students (Table 1). Latinos had the highest score (M=3.67) while Mixed had the lowest (M=2.46) A similar analysis with respect to Ethnic Identity Achievement yielded F (4, 145)= 6.47, $p< .0001$. In this area, Black students had the highest score (M=3.61), while Mixed students had the lowest score (M=2.47). Black, Latino, and Asian students had significantly higher scores than either White students or those with mixed ethnic origins.

Behavior and Ethnicity

To determine if behaviors were related to ethnicity, Chi-square analyses were conducted on the distribution of ethnic groups by the various behaviors studied. Only one of the eight comparisons yielded a significant difference (Pearson's Chi-Square (12) = 46.58, $p <$ .0001). These data indicated that White students tended to date within their own ethnic group while Asians tended to date outside of their ethnic group; hence, 48% of the Asians usually dated outside of their ethnic group while 43% of the White students usually dated

within their own ethnic group. In general, most students reported that they either engaged in activities with an ethnically diverse group of students (e.g., 70.9% reported eating meals and spending their spare time with an ethnically diverse group) or that it didn't matter (e.g., 80.7% said it didn't matter who sat next to them in class).

Interracial Climate

Data were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance of the college climate items by ethnicity. Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests were conducted if the analysis of variance F test was significant at the $p < .001$ level. Three out of the twelve analyses yielded significant differences at this level (Table 2). White students were less likely than Asian, Black, and Latino students to perceive a lack of campus activities for their ethnic group. Similarly, White students were less likely than Latino students to feel left out of college activities because of their ethnicity. Furthermore, White students were less likely than Latino or Asian students to feel pressured to attend ethnic events. On the other hand, Black students felt significantly more pressure than Asian, White or Mixed students to attend ethnic activities. In addition to these differences, there were two trends at the .01 level of significance that are worthy of note: Black students were more likely than Asian or White students to agree that the campus was racially hostile and that students were uneasy in the presence of their group.

Levels of Comfort

With White Students. Four of the 11 analyses yielded significant differences at the .001 level (Table 3). In three of these analyses, Black students were significantly less comfortable than others. Black and Asian students were significantly less comfortable than White students with having a White counselor. Black and Latino students were less comfortable than White students dating a White student, and Black students were less comfortable than White students with a White roommate. In the fourth area, Asian and Latino students were less comfortable than White students discussing racism with a White student. In addition to these findings, there were two trends at the .01 level of significance: Asian students were less comfortable than White students attending a mostly White party, and walking into a room with a group of White people already talking.

With Latino Students. At the .001 level of significance, Asian students were significantly less comfortable than Latino and White students attending a lecture where most of the students were Latino, and Asian students were less comfortable than Latino and Black students attending a mostly Latino party (Table 4). White students were also less comfortable than Latino students attending a mostly Latino party. In addition, there was a trend at the .01 level of significance for Asians to feel less comfortable than Latino and White students about walking into a room of mostly Latino students.

With Black Students. There were no significant differences at the .001 level with respect to how other students described their comfort with interacting with Blacks; however, there were trends in 2 items at the .01 level of significance for Asian students to feel less comfortable than others (Table 5). Asian students were less comfortable than Black and Latino students attending a lecture where most of the students were Black; and they were less comfortable than Latino and White students attending a predominantly Black party.

With Asian Students. As with Black students there were no significant differences at the .001 level of significance (Table 6). Furthermore, there was only one trend at the .01 level. We found that Black students were less comfortable than White students with having an Asian roommate.

DISCUSSION

The data on ethnic identity is interesting for several reasons. First, for at least the Affirmation and Belonging and Ethnic Identity Achievement subscales, it confirms the reliability of Phinney's (1992) measure for use with a college-age population. Secondly, these data are contrary to what was expected, i.e. , White students, despite their comments to the contrary ("I have no ethnic group other than American"), do have a relatively strong sense of ethnic identification and ethnic pride. These findings contrast with Phinney's results where she found that all ethnic groups, including the ethnically mixed, had a stronger sense of ethnic identity than White students. Since our pilot study was conducted at least four years after Phinney's study, our different findings may correspond to a growing awareness of ethnicity on the part of White students as their campuses become increasingly diverse. On the other hand, it was clear that the ethnic minority groups (Asians, Blacks, Latinos) were more concerned than White students with exploring their ethnic roots. This lack of exploration is problematical, because while White students enjoy the privileges of Whiteness, they may have little understanding of how their White identity has affected their lives or the lives of others. McIntosh's (1990) work on white privileges and how they operate as unconscious, invisible assets, illustrates the need for White students to examine more closely what their identification as members of a White ethnic group actually means. The lack of awareness on the part of many White students may make it difficult for them to understand the attitudes and behaviors of ethnic minority students and hamper their efforts to interact with ethnic minority students on a more intimate basis.

Two groups contrasted sharply in how they viewed the interracial climate on campus. White students had a positive view of interracial interactions and did not perceive their ethnicity as a barrier or a burden. Black students tended to describe the climate as more hostile, uneasy, and uninviting. Asian and Latino students held views somewhere between these two contrasting groups, i.e. while not as satisfied with the interracial climate as White students, neither were they as dissatisfied as Black students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The findings on comfort level are intriguing. Asian students expressed the greatest discomfort in interacting with students from other ethnic groups. They expressed discomfort about interacting with White, Latino, and Black students. Their discomfort focused primarily on interacting with groups of other students (e.g., at parties, or in a lecture). Black students were uncomfortable primarily with White students in more intimate situations, such as dating a White student or having a White roommate. Latino and White students appeared to be the most comfortable interacting with other ethnic groups. The data on comfort level indicate that not only were Latino students comfortable interacting with White students (a finding reported by other researchers), but they were also comfortable interacting with other ethnic minority groups. The data on Asian students indicate that they were not as comfortable as previously thought and that the social context is quite important in examining their level of comfort.

The data on the comfort levels that others experience with Black students is quite surprising and conflict with general observations. Our findings suggest that political correctness has, indeed, arrived at these colleges. Thus, because much of the focus has been on prejudice against Black students, we find that only Asian students were willing to admit to some discomfort with interacting with them, while Asian, Black, and Latino students felt free to express discomfort about interacting with White students in a variety of situations. It is almost certain that political correctness is masking the attitudes of others toward Black students, while permitting students to be more honest in their expression of feelings about White students.

Political correctness may also have impacted the data on ethnic identity and behaviors, pressuring students to indicate that they interact with ethnically diverse groups of people, when even the most casual of observations reveal that student friendship patterns remain ethnically segregated. The data on white students dating primarily within their own ethnic group is similar to Hurtado et al.'s (1994) findings which indicate that White students tend to segregate themselves more than other ethnic groups. In addition, the finding that Asians have the highest rate of dating across ethnic lines corresponds with other information indicating that Asians have the highest out-marriage rates ranging from 34.4% for Koreans to 60% for Japanese (Root, 1992).

The data on comfort level and interracial climate also indicate that despite the media attention on white uneasiness and white pride groups, White students feel most supported by their colleges and are quite comfortable interacting with individuals from other ethnic groups.

Limitations

In addition to the small sample size, there are other significant limitations to this study. First, although Blacks, Latinos, and Asians were each treated as uniform ethnic groups, it must be recognized that there are important differences within each of these categories,

especially with the Asian and Latino populations (e.g., national origin, history in the U.S., the extent of color prejudice, and others). Whenever possible, these differences should be documented and explored since they may have implications for inter-ethnic interactions.

These data suggest that political correctness may make it difficult to obtain accurate data from respondents. Consequently, in addition to a survey, an interview may yield richer, more valid data. It is also possible that more subtle measures of attitudes and interactions need to be employed.

These data were obtained from highly selective colleges with relatively small numbers of Latino and Black students. Different results may be obtained at less selective public colleges or universities with larger enrollments of Latino and Black students. In addition, future research should explore the effects of gender, ethnic identity, and socio-economic status on inter-ethnic interactions. For example, it is quite possible that some of our observations about the impact of political correctness may be due to the large number of female respondents in our sample.

Despite these limitations, this pilot study has highlighted the need to continue exploring the rich world of inter-ethnic relations on campus. The data indicate that ethnic minority groups differ not only from White students, but also from each other in how they perceive and interact with each other. Future research should not only map out the patterns of interaction, but indicate at least limited ways in which ethnic interaction can be improved.

References

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 319-342.

Armstrong, G., Neuendorf, K., & Brentar, J. (1992). TV entertainment, news and racial, perceptions of college students. Journal of Communications, 42, 153-176.

Balenger, V.J., Hoffman, M.A., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1992). Racial attitudes among incoming white students: A study of 10-year trends. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 245-252.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. The Pacific Sociological Review, 1, 3-7.

Bourassa, D. (1991). How white students and students of color organize and interact on campus. In Jon C. Dalton (Ed.), New directions for student services, no. 56: The Jossey-Bass higher & adult education series. Racism on campus and confronting racial bias through peer interactions. (pp. 13-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyd, V.S., Shueman, S., McMullan, Y.O, & Fretz, B.R. (1979). Transition groups for black freshman: Integrated service and training. Professional Psychology, 10, 42-48.

Bunzel, J.H. (1992). Race Relations on Campus: Stanford Students Speak. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association.

Claney, D. & Parker, W. (1989). Assessing white racial consciousness and perceived comfort with black individuals: A preliminary study. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 449-451.

D'Andrea, M. & Daniels, J. (1991). Exploring the different levels of multicultural training in counselor education. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70 (1), 78-85.

Davids, L. (1982). Ethnic identity, religiosity, and youthful deviance: The Toronto computer dating project. Adolescence, 17, (67), 673-684.

deArmas, C.P. & McDavis, R.J. (1981). White, Black, and Hispanic students' perceptions of community college environment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22 (4), 337-341.

Diaz-Veizades, J. (1994, August). Socio-psychological dynamics of inter-ethnic relations. Paper presented at the 102nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Erlich, H. (1995). Issues in diversity: Prejudice and ethnoviolence on campus. Review, 6 (2). New Rochelle, NY: Higher Education Extension Service.

Farrell, W.C., Jr., & Joens, C. (1988). Recent racial incidents in higher education: A preliminary perspective. The Urban Review, 20 (3), 221-226.

Fuertes, J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1990). Need and interests of Hispanic students. The College Student Affairs Journal, 10 (2), 16-21.

Hallinan, M.T. (1982). Classroom racial composition and children's friendships. Social Forces, 61, 56-72.

Hallinan, M.T., & Smith, S.S. (1985). The effects of classroom racial composition on students' interracial friendliness. Social Psychology Quarterly, 48, 3-16.

Hurtado, S., Dey, E., & Trevino, J. (1994, April). Exclusion or self-segregation? Interaction across racial/ethnic groups on college campuses. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Jackman, M., & Crane, M. (1986). "Some of my best friends are black...": Interracial friendship and whites' racial attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (4), 459-486.

Leonard, R., & Locke, D. (1993). Communication stereotypes: Is interracial communication possible? Journal of Black Studies, 23, 332-343.

Loo, C.M., & Rolinson, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. Journal of Higher Education, 57 (1) 59-77.

Mack, D.E., & Pittman, E.L. (1993, October). The quality of life: Asian, Black, Latino, and White students. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors, Keystone, CO.

Mann, B.A., & Moser, R.M. (1991). A model for designing peer-initated activities to promote racial awareness and an appreciation of differences. In Jon C. Dalton (Ed.), New directions for student services, no. 56: The Jossey-Bass higher & adult education series. Racism on campus & confronting racial bias through peer interventions. (pp. 53-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Independent School, Winter, 31-36.

Patterson, A.M., Sedlacek, W.E., & Perry, F.W. (1984). Perception of Blacks and Hispanics in two campus environments. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25 (6), 513-519.

Phinney, J.S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. Journal of Adolescent Research, 7, 156-176.

Pogrebin, L.C. (1991). Deborah, Golda, and Me: Being Jewish and Female. New York: Doubleday.

Ponterotto, J. G., Grieger, I., & Heaphy, T.J. (1985). Students together against racial separatism. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26 (3), 251-253.

Pruegger, V.J., & Rogers, T.B. (1994). Cross-cultural sensitivity training: Methods and assessment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18, 369-387.

Quintana, S.M., Vogel, M.C., & Ybarra, V.C. (1991). Meta-analysis of latino students' adjustment in higher education. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13 (2), 155-168.

Rodriguez, R. (1974). Black/Latino relations: An unnecessary conflict. Black Issues in Higher Education, 11 (16), 40-42.

Root, M.P.P. (1992). Racially Mixed People in America. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Schoem, D., & Stevenson, M. (1990). Teaching ethnic identity and intergroup relations: The case of Black-Jewish dialogue. Teachers College Record, 91 (4), 579-594.

Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). Black students on white campuses: 20 years of research. Journal of College Student Personnel, 484-495.

Smith, A. W. (1981). Racial tolerance as a function of group position. American Sociological Review, 46, 558-573.

Soriano, M., Soriano, F. I., & Jimenez, E. (1994). School violence among culturally diverse populations: Sociocultural and institutional considerations. School Psychology Review, 23, 216-235.

Stephan, W., & Stephan, C. (1989). Antecedents of intergroup anxiety in Asian Americas and Hispanic-Americans. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 203-219.

Tate, G.L., & Barker, N.C. (1978). Ethnic variations in the presentation of psychological concerns to the university counseling center. College Student Journal, 12 (1), 12-18.

Toupin, E.S.W., & Son, L. (1991). Preliminary findings on Asian-Americans, "the model minority" in a small private east coast college. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 22 (3), 403-417.

Wanef, Y., Sedlacek, W.E., & Westbrook, F. (1992). Asian-Americans and student organizations: Attitudes and participation. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 214-221.

Webster, D.W., Sedlacek, W.E., & Miyares, J. (1979). A comparison of problems perceived by minority and White university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 165-173.

Westbrook, F.D., Miyares, J., & Roberts, J.H. (1978). Perceived problem areas by black and white students and hints about comparative counseling needs. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25 (2), 119-123.

White, T., & Sedlacek, W. (1987). White students attitudes toward Blacks and Hispanics: Programming implications. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 15, 171-181.

Williams, R.M., Jr. (1964). Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

TABLE 1

ETHNIC IDENTITY SUBSCALE SCORES

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Ethnic Identity Subscales by Ethnicity [a]

Scale	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Ethnic Identity Affirmation and Belonging	3.53	.53	3.67	.60	3.23	.65	2.92	.68	2.46	.64	.0001*
2. Ethnic Identity Achievement	3.61	.28	3.50	.66	3.16	.51	2.52	.58	2.47	.72	.0000*

a. Based on a 4-point scales, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).
b. Analysis of variance with ethnicity as the main effect.
* $p < .001$

TABLE 2: INTERRACIAL CLIMATE ON CAMPUS

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Interracial Climate Items by Ethnicity [a]

Items	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. I feel left out of things because of my ethnic[sic] group while attending this college.	3.25	1.58	3.00	1.11	3.93	1.13	4.25	1.12	3.43	1.81	.0004*
2. Students on this campus prefer being with others of their own ethnic group.	2.25	.71	2.21	.71	2.45	1.18	2.59	1.00	2.14	1.21	.4530
3. Students from other ethnic groups feel uneasy when members of my ethnic group get together in groups.	1.88	1.25	2.58	1.07	3.10	1.01	3.25	.97	2.71	.95	.0012
4. There are not many things at the College for members of my ethnic group to identify with.	2.38	1.19	3.05	1.27	3.48	1.18	4.21	1.16	3.29	1.50	.0000*
5. The college administration supports my ethnic group in its on-campus activities.	3.50	1.20	2.74	.99	2.69	1.04	2.34	1.32	3.29	1.50	.0369
6. The college is trying to eliminate racism/ethnocentrism.	3.25	1.49	2.84	.83	2.97	1.27	2.51	1.04	2.71	1.60	.1778
7. The ethnic climate on campus is hostile.	2.00	1.07	3.00	1.00	3.17	1.07	3.42	.98	3.43	1.27	.0043
8. The ethnic climate in the communities surrounding the college is hostile.	2.00	1.20	2.58	1.02	3.07	.96	2.79	.99	3.00	1.15	.0877
9. The college has been difficult for me to adjust to.	3.00	1.31	3.16	1.30	4.00	1.10	4.05	1.19	3.57	1.81	.0143
10. I feel pressured to attend activities focusing on my ethnic group.	2.88	.64	3.74	1.28	3.83	.89	4.58	.73	4.14	.69	.0000*
11. My experience at this college has improved by ability to interact with people of different ethnic groups.	3.13	1.46	2.05	1.18	2.64	1.28	2.24	1.16	2.86	1.68	.1093
12. Ethnic organizations on campus contribute to the elimination of racism and ethnocentrism.	3.00	1.63	2.68	1.29	3.24	.99	3.05	1.16	3.00	1.15	.6227

a. Based on a 5-point scale, ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

* $p < .001$

TABLE 3: COMFORT LEVEL WITH WHITE STUDENTS

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Comfort Items by Ethnicity [a]

Items	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Talking to White students on campus.	1.75	.89	1.79	.98	1.66	.97	1.24	.63	1.57	.79	.0137
2. Discussing racism/ethnocentrism with White students.	2.38	1.06	2.79	.92	2.28	1.16	1.65	.88	2.29	.95	.0000*
3. Participating in counseling with a White counselor.	2.75	1.49	1.95	.91	2.15	1.03	1.47	.85	1.71	.95	.0003*
4. Attending a lecture where almost everyone in attendance is White.	1.75	1.04	1.68	.67	1.93	1.07	1.44	.90	2.57	1.62	.0133
5. Being at a party where most of the people are White.	2.38	1.30	2.11	.81	2.18	1.16	1.53	.93	2.57	1.62	.0020
6. Having a White roommate.	2.38	1.51	1.53	.90	1.62	.82	1.19	.63	1.71	.95	.0004*
7. Dating a White person.	2.63	1.60	2.11	1.45	1.62	.94	1.24	.71	1.71	1.11	.0001*
8. Studying with White classmates.	1.63	.74	1.37	.60	1.66	1.04	1.21	.65	1.57	.79	.0540
9. Competing for grades against Whites in a classroom.	1.75	.71	1.83	1.10	1.59	.98	1.43	1.03	1.71	1.11	.5586
10. Coming into a room where a group of White people are already talking.	2.25	1.04	1.84	.90	2.07	1.16	1.40	.80	2.00	.82	.0016
11. Having a White person as a close friend.	1.38	.74	1.37	.76	1.45	.78	1.13	.61	1.43	.53	.1561

a. Based on a 5-point scale, ranging from very comfortable (1) to very uncomfortable (5).

b. Analysis of variance with Ethnicity as the main effect.

* $p < .001$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4: COMFORT LEVEL WITH LATINO STUDENTS

Means, Standard Deviation, and Significant Differences Among Comfort Items by Ethnicity [a]

Items	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Talking to Latino students on campus.	1.50	.76	1.11	.46	1.79	1.01	1.38	.70	1.57	.79	.0318
2. Discussing racism/ethnocentrism with Latino students.	1.50	.76	1.37	.76	2.25	1.14	2.07	1.06	2.29	1.11	.0248
3. Participating in counseling with a Latino counselor.	2.00	.76	1.42	.84	2.07	.96	1.73	.86	1.67	.82	.1352
4. Attending a lecture where almost everyone in attendance is Latino.	1.63	.74	1.11	.46	2.34	1.26	1.86	.94	2.00	1.00	.0010*
5. Being at a party where most of the people are Latino.	1.50	.53	1.11	.46	2.59	1.18	2.17	1.02	2.14	.90	.0000*
6. Having a Latino roommate.	1.88	1.36	1.11	.46	1.76	.95	1.30	.73	1.29	.49	.0132
7. Dating a Latino person.	1.63	1.06	1.32	.67	2.17	1.17	1.54	.90	1.43	.79	.0148
8. Studying with Latino classmates.	1.50	.53	1.11	.46	1.69	1.00	1.30	.70	1.43	.53	.0674
9. Competing for grades against Latinos in a classroom.	1.63	.74	1.28	.67	1.55	.87	1.47	1.04	1.50	.55	.8784
10. Coming into a room where a group of Latino people are already talking.	1.50	.53	1.21	.54	2.34	1.14	1.78	.95	1.86	.38	.0012
11. Having a Latino person as a close friend.	1.13	.35	1.11	.46	1.48	.78	1.17	.59	1.29	.49	.1494

a. Based on a 5-point scale, ranging from very comfortable (1) to very uncomfortable (5).
b. Analysis of variance with Ethnicity as the main effect.

* $p < .001$

TABLE 5: COMFORT LEVEL WITH BLACK STUDENTS

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Comfort Items by Ethnicity [a]

Items	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Talking to Black students on campus.	1.75	1.16	1.47	.84	2.17	1.17	1.64	.79	1.71	.76	.0586
2. Discussing racism/ethnocentrism with Black students.	1.63	1.41	2.11	1.24	2.93	1.33	2.48	1.13	2.71	.95	.0398
3. Participating in counseling with a Black counselor.	1.75	1.39	1.68	.82	2.39	1.20	1.82	.89	1.86	.69	.0724
4. Attending a lecture where almost everyone in attendance is Black.	1.63	1.06	1.89	.94	2.90	1.32	2.30	1.07	2.43	.98	.0092
5. Being at a party where most of the people are Black.	2.13	1.25	2.16	.76	3.24	1.30	2.53	1.11	2.29	.76	.0059
6. Having a Black roommate.	1.75	1.39	1.47	.90	1.86	.95	1.45	.80	1.43	.53	.2400
7. Dating a Black person.	1.63	1.06	1.95	1.27	2.52	1.38	1.88	1.12	1.86	.90	.1257
8. Studying with Black classmates.	1.50	1.07	1.32	.67	1.83	1.23	1.30	.70	1.29	.49	.0656
9. Competing for grades against Blacks in a classroom.	2.00	1.31	1.44	.78	1.52	.78	1.51	1.05	1.50	.55	.7247
10. Coming into a room where a group of Black people are already talking.	1.88	1.36	1.84	1.01	2.66	1.26	2.10	1.04	2.00	.58	.0784
11. Having a Black person as a close friend	1.00	.00	1.37	.68	1.69	1.00	1.30	.72	1.43	.53	.0999

a. Based on a 5-point scale, ranging from very comfortable (1) to very uncomfortable (5).

b. Analysis of variance with Ethnicity as the main effect.

* $p < .001$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6: COMFORT LEVEL WITH ASIAN STUDENTS

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significant Differences Among Comfort Items by Ethnicity [a]

Items	Blacks		Latinos		Asians		Whites		Mixed		Significance Level [b]
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
1. Talking to Asian students on campus.	2.00	1.07	1.37	.90	1.52	.69	1.32	.67	1.43	.53	.1286
2. Discussing racism/ethnocentrism with Asian students.	2.25	1.28	1.79	.85	1.62	.90	1.88	.96	2.57	.98	.1354
3. Participating in counseling with an Asian counselor.	2.63	1.41	1.74	.99	1.74	1.06	1.78	.90	2.14	1.35	.1789
4. Attending a lecture where almost everyone in attendance is Asian.	2.75	1.49	1.63	.83	1.76	1.12	1.87	1.00	2.14	.90	.1103
5. Being at a party where most of the people are Asian.	2.63	1.30	2.11	.99	2.00	1.25	2.16	1.06	2.43	.79	.6388
6. Having an Asian roommate.	2.25	1.39	1.58	.90	1.52	.78	1.27	.66	1.29	.49	.0085
7. Dating an Asian person.	2.25	1.16	1.84	1.12	1.79	1.05	1.67	.98	1.71	.76	.6179
8. Studying with Asian classmates.	1.88	.64	1.37	.68	1.48	.78	1.30	.75	1.71	1.11	.2018
9. Competing for grades against Asians in a classroom.	1.50	.53	2.00	1.00	1.86	1.22	1.55	1.10	1.67	.82	.4587
10. Coming into a room where a group of Asian people are already talking.	1.88	.83	1.79	.92	1.86	1.06	1.72	.91	1.86	.69	.9477
11. Having an Asian person as a close friend.	1.25	.46	1.21	.54	1.31	.66	1.16	.55	1.29	.49	.7830

a. Based on a 5-point scale, ranging from very comfortable (1) to very uncomfortable (5).

b. Analysis of variance with Ethnicity as the main effect.

* $p < .001$